

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That for the words “commencement of this session” the words “commencement of this session” may be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

“That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

“That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Second Amendment) Bill 1957, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Second Amendment) Bill 1957, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE CITY OF BANGALORE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I move :

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amend-

ment) Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—This does not require any elaborate explanation. The salary at present proposed to the Commissioner is Rs. 1,400 which was based on the previous scales, i.e., those that were prevailing in the old Mysore State. Now the Government may post an I.A.S. Officer whose scale of pay runs up to Rs. 1,800. This relaxation is called for to enable the Government to post an I.A.S. Officer as Commissioner.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Mr. Speaker, in fact the Corporation was only too eager to see that some amendments to the Corporation Act were brought before this House. In pursuance of that, Government had also responded in some measure by constituting a committee just a few months ago comprising the ex-Mayors and M.L.As. to go into the matter of the amendments and a comprehensive amendment was placed before the Government and it has come before the House now. In fact the Corporation is expecting to see that this House endorses it. I may also congratulate the Hon'ble Minister for P.W.D. who has certainly acted in this behalf because he had assured some time back with regard to water supply and I may say that something has been done. Water scarcity has been relieved to a certain extent. But I may incidentally tell him that, while we are at it, uniformity has to be maintained inasmuch as there is difference between the Civil area and the City area in respect of this measure. That is one illustration. There are several others. Even with regard to court fee stamps half a per cent is charged in the City whereas it is two per cent in the Civil area. And then with regard to School fee also there is difference. All these matters are still pending. We expected some measures in this regard. The Corporation has been expecting legislation for

(SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU)
slum improvement. Then for a uniform . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—How is all that relevant?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I will tell you, Sir. I will come to that in a minute. I will tell you the amendments we were anticipating. The thing is slum improvement. There is what is called Town Planning in the Cities of Madras, Hyderabad and Bombay. An amendment as in Madras has to be provided and we are waiting for that. On the other hand, here is a piece-meal legislation where Rs. 1,400 is increased. I want to know what is the necessity of this legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know whether the Hon'ble Member is supporting or opposing this legislation?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—A legislation of this type should be more comprehensive and what is more defective in this, I may place before the Government without any hesitation. Has the Corporation asked for this legislation? Has the Corporation been consulted in this behalf? When the Corporation has to bear this expenditure of having that officer, should not the Corporation in normal course be consulted? They have not sent any resolution in this behalf. Nothing has been done and that is my chief grouse. For any legislation a formal consultation with the Corporation or a resolution from the Corporation should have been received by the Government. I tell you, Sir, that the Corporation has never been consulted in this matter. Secondly, Sir, in the Act, we have got Rs. 1,400 as the pay of the officer. Just yesterday the Government was pleased to place before us as to what were the remunerations paid to I.A.S. Officers. They start from Rs. 300 and go up to Rs. 1,100.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I must interrupt and say that the scale of I.A.S. Officers runs up to Rs. 1,800. There are two scales. One is for juniors and the other is for seniors.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I will just read out the answer given to question 815. For married officers the scale runs from Rs. 300 to Rs. 500

and from Rs. 501 to Rs. 750 and from Rs. 751 to Rs. 1,000 and from Rs. 1,001 to Rs. 1,100 plus D.A. of Rs. 75, Rs. 80 and Rs. 100. For unmarried officers it goes up to Rs. 1,000 and from Rs. 1,001 to Rs. 1,075. That is what I see before me in the answers placed to a query before this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please finish; the time is up.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Only two points and I am done, Sir. The Corporation has been expecting the sanction of the D.A. or the enhancement of the allowances passed by the Government for all the staff of the Corporation. That is the matter in which they are looking, and not that a single officer's salary should be increased. It comes within the purview of the Act. One thousand and four hundred has already been approved by the House. Lastly, I only say this, Sir. The most important thing is what is called freedom of speech. Once we pass this legislation, the Corporation has not got the right of commenting on the proceedings. That is forbidden. The local Finance Committee or any other committee . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Deenadayalu Naidu, I cannot understand what has that got to do with this Bill. I can understand that there are certain grave handicaps in legislating for the Corporation. But that has nothing to do with this.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It is not a handicap, Sir. It is an ordinary democratic policy that I am trying to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But that is not relevant.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The Corporation should have been consulted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On this Bill?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Not even a recommendation has been received from the Corporation, and not even a consultation has been made. In fact, when the Government appoints this officer, a formal consultation is made. When they are increasing the pay of the officer, should not the Corporation be consulted? Does it not

amount to—I do not wish to use strong words—passing a vote of censure on the Corporation? It is nothing but that. What is wrong in consulting the Corporation? Where is the hurry in rushing through this piece of legislation? Government has replied to a query of the Taxation and Finance Enquiry Committee that in view of the set up of local bodies, more and more autonomy should be given to them as they are instruments of national policy. When that is the scope of recommendation of that Committee, the Corporation has not even been consulted when this Bill was brought before us. When you admit that it is important and when there is a recommendation from the Central Government, to which you are also a party, why was not the Corporation consulted? I only pray that whenever legislation is brought affecting the Corporation, they should be consulted invariably. I hope that will be followed in due course.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚೆನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಮೂಲ ಭೂತ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ದಕ್ಕ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಾವ ಹಿಡಿತ-ಕೂಡ ಇರಬಾರದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಇಂಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಅಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ರುಗಳ ಹಿಡಿತ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ? “The Commissioner shall be paid out of the Municipal fund” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಫಂಡ್‌ನಿಂದ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಹಿಡಿತಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಕೊಲೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರೇ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಆ ನೇಮಕರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮೀಷನರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರು, ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರ ದರ್ಜೆಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಅಫೀಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಾವ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಸೀನಿಯಾರಿಟಿ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಇಟ್ಟಿರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಫೀಸರು ಎಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರ ದರ್ಜೆಗೆ ಬರುವವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ

ವಾತಾವರಣ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಹೇಗೆ ಯೂನಿ ವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಆಟೊನಮಸ್ ಎಂದು ಡಿಕ್ಲೇರ್ ಮಾಡಿ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಕಣ್‌ನೋಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿತ ದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದೀರಿ. ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ದರ್ಜೆಯ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಯೇ ಬೇರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರು ಇದ್ದು ಹಿಂದೆ ಆಗದೇ ಇರುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗಿ ಏನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಆಗಿದೆ? ಉನ್ನತ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿತ್ವ ಹಿರಿಯರು ದಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು, ಜನಗಳ, ಗಾಡಿಗಳ ತಿರುಗಾಡುವ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ? ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪ್ಲಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. ಅಫೀಸರು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮುಂಚೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದರ್ಜೆ, ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಾಕಿಯ ವಿಷಯ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹಾಳಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಲಿ. ಜನಗಳ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದು ರಸ್ತೆ. ಕಾಣದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಲಕ್ಷಣಪಲಕ್ಷ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಕಾಣತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಕಂಡರೂ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಅಫೀಸರ ಮೇಲೆ, ಎಕ್ಸಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಅಫೀಸರ ಮೇಲೆ, ಕಮೀಷನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಗಳು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಏನಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿದೂಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲಿ, ಮಾಡದೇಯಿರಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವೇ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಜನರಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಅವರು, ಅವರು ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡುವಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೇ ಏನು ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಗೆ ತರಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುವುದು ಸಹಜ ತಾವೆ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಬ್ಯಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೇಯಿರುವವರು ಎಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಚುಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಸರ್ವ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಮನೋಧೇ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ನ್ಯಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾಗಣದಿಂದಲೂ ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರು ಬಾಯಿಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರ ಘೋಷಣೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ರಚಿತವಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವ ಹಿಡಿತವನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill on a few grounds. As mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I do not think any I.A.S. Officer is necessary to be the executive head of the Bangalore Corporation. I have been observing for the last ten years that the Government imposes an executive head on the

(DR. T. PARTHASARATHY)

Corporation and withdraws him when he is just getting to understand the affairs of the Corporation. I would rather ask the Minister for Local Self-Government to raise a senior executive of the Corporation who is well versed in the affairs of the Corporation to the I.A.S. cadre and post him as the executive head. It appears that they are going to post a man of the I.A.S. cadre who is well versed in the affairs of the Corporation for the full period of the term of the Corporation, i.e., for three years. From my experience I have found that, though the I.A.S. cadre is an intelligent cadre, they can never understand the complicated affairs of the Corporation. As the amendment says, the Corporation will have to pay the scale of pay and allowances allowed to a senior officer of the I.A.S. cadre. I want to bring to the notice of the Minister that the Corporation Commissioner is given a free car from the Corporation for his use. I am afraid that he will be drawing the additional allowance in addition to getting a free car. I do not think this fact has been taken into account. I think the Government should withdraw the car if the Bill is passed in this House.

Another point is that we are all aware of the financial state of affairs of our Corporation. To be plain, for such a large extension like Malleswaram only Rs. 7,000 have been set apart for road repairs. Yet, the Government imposes such a highly salaried officer as an I.A.S. officer on the Corporation. So, I request the Hon'ble Minister not to impose such restrictions on the Corporation in the selection of the executive head. As my Hon'ble friend Sri Deenadayalu Naidu said, the Corporation has never been consulted in the past. This is the attitude of the Government towards the Corporation whenever any legislation pertaining to the Corporation is undertaken. So, I request that this Bill be withdrawn or amended suitably to suit the finances of the Corporation and the will of the Corporation.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, I rise only to substantiate the charge made by the Hon'ble Member

Sri Puttaramiya, namely, that this piece of amended legislation is contrary to democratic principles. While saying this I am aware that the Minister in charge might reply that the Corporation Act itself is going to be amended and that it is surely going to come up. But all the same it is necessary to point out one thing. Contrast the attitude of the Government in regard to this matter. What Sri Deenadayalu Naidu and others have expressed is that the Corporation ought to have been consulted in this matter. I am surprised at the attitude of the Government because even when unanimous resolutions have been passed by the Corporation in respect of certain very vital matters which the Corporation deemed to be very necessary in its financial interest, they have been turned down mercilessly as it were. For example, recently I know one instance. For instance, some time ago the Corporation passed a resolution saying that cycle licence ought not to be collected in Bangalore Corporation area for the simple reason that the net return from such a levy was not adequate to meet even the cost of administration. That was a unanimous resolution and yet it was not taken note of and was turned down. On the other hand, in order to improve the finances they passed another resolution saying that they must be permitted to levy municipal toll, tax, etc., in respect of Government buildings, railway buildings, etc. That was a measure which was solely in the interest of the Corporation. It was necessary to augment the finances of the Corporation and to give better service so far as Bangalore is concerned. For the simple reason that Bangalore is the headquarters of Karnatak and one of the most important cities in the whole of South India attracting to it all the tourists, the Central Government institutions, etc., more care ought to have been bestowed on this question. We find that roads have deteriorated and municipal services also have deteriorated. In spite of it, we find no change in the attitude of the Government. So, looking at the attitude of the Government in relation to pass measures, it is obvious that the Government would not be prepared to give up its undemocratic

attitude towards the Corporation. That is why I feel definite that this measure ought not to find a place on the Statute Book. I oppose the Bill on these grounds.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೇನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಪ್ರಥಮತಃ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಬಹುಶಃ ಪುನಃ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳಿವೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸದೆ, ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೇವಲ ಒಬ್ಬ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಒಂದು ಮೂಲ ತತ್ವವನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಅಥವಾ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣದಿಂದ ಈ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಅನುಮತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಏಕಾಏಕಿ ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ:ವರಿಸಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನವರ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕಾಲವಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದ ನಾನಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲರವರೂ ಆ ತೃಪ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

5-30 P.M.

ಇದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮುಗ್ಗಟ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಾಗುವ ತನಕ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲಿದೆ. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಣ ಪಾತಾಳದ ಕಹಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದು, ವಾಹನ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ, ದಿನಭತ್ಯೆ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅದೊಂದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ; ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಓದಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಇದೆ, ಪೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನ ವಾಹನ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಇದು ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. I.A.S. ಅಫೀಸರೊಬ್ಬರು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನ ಆಡಳಿತ ವರ್ಗದ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೂ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿ ಕಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳೂ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೇ ಅನೇಕ ಅನುಭವಸ್ಥರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಹುಟ್ಟು ವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಾಕಾಲ ದಲ್ಲಯೂ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಶಾದಾಯಕವಾಗಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಣದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಮತ್ತು

ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೇ ಹೊರತು, ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒತ್ತಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಉದಾರ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಹಟವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ತತ್ಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬಾರದು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈವಾಡ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಇರಬಾರದು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಪುನಃ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನವರು ರೆಸೋಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I was indeed very sorry to hear some of the irrelevant arguments. I was almost staggered when I heard my Hon'ble friend Sri Deenadayalu Naidu. What is intended is to amend section 13 only. It is a very simple thing. The other questions may be taken up with Government separately. Section 13 as it stands reads thus:

"The Commissioner shall be paid out of the municipal fund such salary and allowances not exceeding Rs. 1,400 per mensem in the aggregate, as may from time to time be fixed by Government."

The amendment that is sought to be made in section 13 is this:

"The Commissioner shall be paid out of the municipal fund such monthly salary and allowances, as the Government may, from time to time, by order, determine."

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—That is giving a blank cheque.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Government never took the initiative for this. It is the Corporation which wanted this change. I shall read from the correspondence.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Question.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—As far back as 29th December 1956 a resolution was passed by the Standing Committee (Taxation and Finance):

"Resolved that the Recommendation of the Standing Committee

(SRI T. MARIAPPA
(Taxation and Finance) dated
29th December 1956 that Sri K.
Mohamed Ahmed, I.A.S., Commis-
sioner, Corporation of Bangalore,
be sanctioned a special pay of
Rs. 100 p.m. with effect from the
date of his taking charge, viz.,
25th October 1956 as per Govern-
ment Order dated 27th October
1956 be approved."

The Resolution was moved by Sri M.
R. Narasimha Iyengar and seconded
by Sri P. S. K. Naidu.

Now, Sir, the post of the Commis-
sioner is an encadred post. It is an
I.A.S. post. That must be borne in
mind. The Commissioner was drawing
less than Rs. 1,400 per month.
According to an old resolution they
were giving to all the previous
Commissioners Rs. 200 per month as
special pay, but we got it reduced to
Rs. 100. Let this be borne in mind.
In addition to this, the Commissioner
was getting annual increments. So
when with the increment the salary
became Rs. 1,450 that could not be
drawn. Then they wrote a letter
under the signature of the Mayor. The
Mayor represents the leading party in
the Corporation. I shall read the
letter of the Mayor:

"In forwarding herewith a copy
of Corporation Resolution No. 106,
dated 28th March 1957 sanctioning
a special pay of Rs. 100 p.m. to
the Commissioner with effect from
25th October 1956, I write to
state as follows:

As per Government Order
No., dated 20th October 1956
I have assumed charge as
Commissioner, Corporation of the
City of Bangalore, on the forenoon
of 25th October 1956 and I am
drawing a salary of Rs. 1,400 per
month. The Corporation was
allowing the previous Commis-
sioners to draw a sum of Rs. 200
as duty allowance, but the
Government in their Order.....
dated 27th October 1956 have
proposed only Rs. 100 as special
pay for the Commissioner,
Corporation of the City of
Bangalore.

In accordance with the above
Government Order a note placed
before the Corporation recommend-
ing the grant of a special pay of
Rs. 100 per month from 25th
October 1956, has been approved
by them.

In this connection, I wish to
state that according to section 13
of the Corporation Act, the pay
and allowances of the Commissioner
are limited to Rs. 1,400 per
month. The matter of amending
this section proposing to raise the
present limit of Rs. 1,400 to
Rs. 1,800 is pending before the
Government. Action may kindly
be taken to amend the section
early.

I request you kindly to obtain
Government sanction to the above
Corporation resolution and in
anticipation of receipt of the
Government Order I have requested
the Corporation Auditor to admit
the claim in audit as per G. O.
quoted above. The action taken
may kindly be approved.

(Sd.) Jeenabhai Davidoss,
Mayor.

(Sd.) K. Mohamed Ahmed,
Commissioner."

Sir, in accordance with the wishes of
the Corporation it has been done.
Moreover, it is an encadred post and
so an I.A.S. Officer has been posted
there. No other officer could be
posted. Therefore you must kindly see
all these things know as to why we have
brought this amendment. I would
personally feel happy if a junior officer
could be posted there. After all,
Bangalore City Corporation is the
premier municipality and no non-I.A.S.
Officer could be posted there.

There is another point on which my
friend unfortunately has bestowed
little attention. In the answer given
in this House to a question, I have
read out that it relates to dearness
allowance, junior and senior I.A.S.
scales. It is obvious to anybody that
I.A.S. senior scale runs up to Rs. 1,800
Under the old dispensation that

Government Officer was drawing Rs. 1,400. Now, under the new dispensation, that officer's salary goes up to Rs. 1,800. Unless the Corporation sanctions that amount, he cannot draw Rs. 1,800. That is why we have stated that it will be determined from time to time. It does not mean we are going to give him Rs. 2,500. Sir, I want to take the House into confidence. We have not taken the time scale post, because the pay would be higher. Still, it will be a question of giving a higher special pay all over India like Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 to an I.A.S. Officer. But wherever there is need, we will put an axe and we will retrench expenditure. Simply because Section 13 has not been amended, even though an officer is legitimately due to draw Rs. 1,500, he has not been allowed to draw. The poor man has written to Government. Therefore, there is nothing unusual. We are not going to do anything abnormal, or out of the way. There may be other questions between the Commissioner and the Corporation. If my friend has got any problems, he can approach the Government, and all those problems could be taken up separately. Here is a simple proposition to relieve a man of his anxiety. It is not an individual case. Any other I.A.S. man may be posted there. If he has to draw his pay, Section 13 is an impediment. It is only with a view to remove that anomaly that we are amending Section 13. What does the amendment say? It only seeks to empower the Government to determine the salary of the Commissioner from time to time. The Government may post a man drawing Rs. 1,200 or Rs. 1,300. When once it is an encadred post and when once it is included in the I.A.S. posts, we cannot put a non-I.A.S. man unless the Home Ministry approves of it. So, kindly bear in mind that nothing unusual or abnormal is going to be done. We are not going out of the way. I do not know why one should get disturbed; please don't see through coloured glasses. That is my earnest appeal. I hope, Sir, I have made matters very clear and I request that this simple matter may be accepted.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The Hon'ble Minister for Finance referred to one aspect of the question. I referred to the points decided at the Mayors' Conference. I want to know what has happened to them and the resolutions passed by the Corporation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sorry that is a different matter altogether. The question is:

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The clauses of the Bill will now be taken up. As there are no amendments, I will put all the clauses together. Clauses 2 and 1, Title and Preamble. The question is:

“That Clauses 2 and 1, the Title and the Preamble form part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I move:

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment, Bill, 1957 be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1957 be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE MYSORE MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Industries and Home Affairs).—Sir, I move:

“That the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 1957, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”